

the U.S. and the Soviet Union have recognized their inability to defend against missile attack, the expenditure of large sums of money for new defenses against bombers is very wasteful. The AWACS should be cancelled with a saving of \$200 million.

DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS LEADING TO LARGE FUTURE EXPENDITURES

The Fiscal 1974 budget calls for the initial development of a Strategic Cruise Missile (\$15 million), a mobile ICBM (\$6 million), and the deployment of a phased array radar for warning against submarine launched missiles (\$31 million). None of these are justified. Cruise missiles are unnecessary when ballistic missiles have a free ride to targets in the Soviet Union; a mobile ICBM is unnecessary in view of the invulnerability of our submarine missile force with more than 5,000 warheads; and additional means of warning of submarine missiles is superfluous because of the recent successful deployment of a satellite-based missile warning system. In addition, the program calls for spending \$95 million for the development of advanced ballistic re-entry systems and technology. The project could be destabilizing and erode the agreed mutual deterrent balance, spurring the arms race. These four programs should be eliminated or reduced to very low levels with a saving of \$122 million.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(Recommended savings: \$556 million)

The United States must adjust the military assistance program to the new era which has opened in international affairs. The detente among the superpowers has downgraded the significance of political/military developments in regions which were formerly the chief arenas of Big Power confrontation. Moreover, U.S. experience in Indochina in the past decade has shown the limits of military power, direct and by proxy, even when applied in huge amounts, to complex economic, political, and social conflicts within developing nations.

The American people recognize that the United States has neither the resources nor the need to be the world's policeman. It is equally wrong to continue to seek to be the world's chief distributor of subsidized arms and ammunition. Our arms aid and sale policies have led us to arm both sides in local conflicts. They increase the danger that the United States will align itself against the hopes and aspirations of the majority of the world's people by arming authoritarian governments representing a narrow political-military-economic elite.

In the current fiscal year the Executive Branch estimates that military and related assistance and arms sales programs total more than \$8.4 billion. Much of this assistance—some \$4 billion—is made available through programs which require no Congressional appropriations, for example, Department of Defense foreign military cash sales, excess defense articles, and ship loans.

Some parts of our military assistance and sales programs are clearly in our national interest, and should be continued. But major cuts can be made.

FEASIBLE REDUCTIONS IN THE FOREIGN MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

(In millions of dollars)

Program	Fiscal year 1974 budget request	Proposed	Savings
Military grant assistance (request includes \$180,000,000 for Cambodia)...	652	270	1,202
Military education and training.....	33	25	8
Military credit sales...	525	200	325

Program	Fiscal year 1974 budget request	Proposed	Savings
Credit sales ceiling...	(760)	(700)	(60)
Security supporting assistance.....	100	95	5
Total.....	1,310	590	540

¹ Eliminating the \$180,000,000 request for military aid to Cambodia is included in our recommended Southeast Asia cuts, and not here.

Additional savings can be made by reducing Military Assistance Advisory Groups, missions, and military groups attached to U.S. embassies around the world. These groups, which promote U.S. military sales and services, and even the military aid program, too often play a role independent of the U.S. ambassador who is nominally in control. The Administration estimates MAAG/Mission/Military Group costs for Fiscal 1974 as follows: \$15.8 million from the Military Assistance Program and \$50 million from Department of Defense Funds. We recommend a 25 per cent cut this year leading to a total phaseout of the program. Total savings for aid to foreign nations and U.S. military missions: \$556 million.

(Published by Project on Budget Priorities, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. During recent years when funding for the Department of Defense and other military-related activities has rarely been questioned, the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor have been under continuing resolutions for their appropriations while facing dwindling resources for many program areas. This, together with unprecedented appropriation impoundments in the domestic areas, have resulted in serious deterioration of the quality of many public services and the postponement of pressing domestic needs.

The adverse outcome for domestic programs compared to military programs is described in the recent Brookings budget report:

Almost all the budget cuts were made in civilian programs, especially those whose expenditure levels are easiest for the executive branch to control. (Programs such as social security cannot be controlled through the budget process but require changes in the law.) Indeed, after account is taken of the inevitable rise in prices in the next year, the real value of expenditures for those civilian programs in which outlays are relatively controllable will fall by some \$3.6 billion from 1973 to 1974.

In contrast, cuts in defense programs were small. In fact, after allowance is made for pay and price increases and for the declining cost of Vietnam, military expenditures on peacetime forces will rise by about \$2 billion between 1973 and 1974.

Reallocation of a cut in the military budget of up to \$7 billion will be a significant shift in our resources. In simple terms we can easily redirect these billions from defense programs into domestic areas listed below, following actions which this Congress and previous Congresses have already taken:

Housing, community development and urban redevelopment;

Resource and environmental protection;

Education;

Health care and manpower;

Manpower and emergency employment;

Rural development; and
Poverty and social services.

In all of these areas, the administration has eliminated or cut back on programs which were providing valuable services to millions of Americans. Mental health services phased out, manpower and job training programs reduced, public employment programs terminated, housing subsidy programs eliminated, antipollution funds cut back, economic development programs halted—all this done in the name of "fiscal responsibility" while defense spending seems to receive immunity from the President's budget axe. The sick, the elderly, the poor, the handicapped, the urban dweller and rural Americans must wait at the end of the line while the administration is preoccupied with meeting the needs of an insatiable Department of Defense.

The time has come for a change in this practice. And this first year of peace after a decade of war should mark the beginning of a trend in reduced defense spending.

Finally, let us now reduce the Department of Defense appropriation for reasons of fiscal responsibility. The Congress must do this to succeed in enacting a noninflationary budget while preserving the constitutional powers of the legislative branch to determine spending priorities.

The inflation plaguing our Nation is taking a severe toll. The well-being of millions of Americans is being threatened more in the marketplace than by military force. The poor, the elderly and infirm on fixed incomes, home buyers, middle class consumers are burdened by high prices and soaring interest rates. The President has taken dramatic steps to hold down Federal outlays to \$268.7 billion in fiscal 1974.

Our economic ills were further complicated by two official and one unofficial devaluations of the dollar in world markets. An adverse balance of payments has contributed to the decline of the dollar. According to the Economic Report of the President—January 1973; page 293—military transactions—excluding military grants—account for \$3.563 billion, 41 percent of the balance-of-payments deficit.

Both houses of the Congress have responded to the economic crisis by enacting ceilings on Federal outlays in fiscal 1974. On May 18, the Senate voted a ceiling of \$268 billion (S. 373) and on July 25, the House passed a limit of \$267.1 billion (H.R. 8480). Because it is doubtful that the Congress will increase tax revenues during this session, it has become clear that we must confront the question of priorities head on, unlike previous years when we appropriated under the philosophy that we could have all the guns and all the butter we needed.

The limitations on outlays severely restrict legislative option. Congress does not legislate outlays, we legislate budget authority.

The total budget authority in fiscal 1974 requiring current action by Congress is \$175.2 billion. However, only \$126.4 billion is relatively controllable under exist-

ing law. The startling fact is that \$72.4 billion or 57 percent of all controllable appropriations are contained in the Department of Defense appropriations bill before this subcommittee. To take it one step further, if all foreign and military controllable items are factored out, the controllable appropriations for domestic programs total about \$33 billion or only 26 percent of all controllable appropriations. The Labor-HEW bill contains only \$13 billion in controllables—10 percent of the total controllables.

Therefore, it is very clear that the Congress has an awesome responsibility to consider very carefully how 57 percent of all controllable appropriations are to be spent. The situation is slightly worse when we consider that enactments for fiscal 1974 have already exceeded the administration requests by \$1.66 billion in budget authority—excluding construction authorization for highways, airports, and urban mass transit—and \$1.44 billion in outlays. The ultimate priorities of our Federal Government are in the balance.

Therefore, I recommend that the Senate scrutinize individual programs and line items to make a total reduction of at least 10 percent from the administration request. If the full Appropriations Committee does not make such a cut, I will offer an amendment on the Senate floor to enact a cut in the DOD appropriations bill which will bring it to a level up to \$7 billion below the original request. I intend to incorporate language into my amendment, if offered, to preserve adequate congressional oversight during implementation of the cut by requiring the Department of Defense to obtain approval from both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees before spending cuts can be put into effect.

We should complete our withdrawal from Indochina, we should cut the fat out of our bloated military budget, we should readjust our defense deployments to meet our real security needs, but most of all, we must not retreat from our responsibilities to provide for the needs of our people.

It is incumbent upon the Congress as it considers the 1974 Defense appropriations bill to act as an ad hoc national priorities committee. For, in fact, it is in this Defense appropriations bill and this bill alone that the major reductions will be made which will permit the Congress to proceed in a responsible manner within its self-imposed budget ceiling to reallocate funds, and provide for an overall noninflationary appropriations pattern when all actions are completed on the fiscal 1974 appropriations.

Finally, Mr. President, just to summarize what I have in mind, President Nixon said last week that he will veto any cuts in his \$87 billion defense budget, or any increases in domestic spending. I want to tell the President most respectfully that Congress will not be bent or cowed into submission by veto threats. As I said earlier, last year Congress cut the defense budget by \$5.2 billion. This year we ought to be able to do at least that, and possibly up to as high as \$7 billion, and still retain our commanding lead in military strength and capability.

I will join with others here in support of such an effort, and I plan to propose such a cut when the military appropriation bill comes before the Senate. I will work with the coalition of mayors and Governors, trade unionists, health groups, and concerned citizens in an attempt to put a spending ceiling on the bill. At a time when President Nixon wants to make reductions in housing, community development and urban redevelopment, resource and environmental protection, education, health care and manpower, manpower and emergency employment, rural development, and poverty and social services, he wants Congress to increase the defense budget by about \$5.6 billion, to a level higher than at any time during the Vietnam war.

The time has come to strengthen our national security by making America a better place in which to live, and I am hopeful that when the bill comes from the Appropriations Committee, many of these cuts will already have been provided for, or been voted upon by that committee.

Our Appropriations Committee is a very responsible body. I am sure that it will carefully scrutinize all of these areas of defense spending increases, and I know that there is not a Member of this entire body who would do anything willfully or intentionally to in any way impair or jeopardize the national security of this country. What we are basically talking about here is trying to take our defense needs and put them in a time frame that permits us to have a more orderly expenditure of funds, and not to go on one of these programs of accelerated defense spending at a time when there is no demonstrable evidence of necessity for it.

I believe that by some prudent work and careful planning, we can have the defense structure we need within reasonable limits and make appropriate reductions in the administration's defense request; and I also believe that it is mandatory that the manpower levels, both military and civilian, be critically examined by Congress. For the life of me, I cannot understand why the Defense Department needs over a million civilian employees for a defense establishment of slightly over 2 million. I cannot understand why we need twice as many officers in 1973, with a military establishment of slightly over 2 million, as we had in 1945, when we had manpower of over 12 million. On its face there is something wrong and it is imperative that we put a halt to this. If the Department of Defense is unwilling to do so by its own administrative action, then the Congress of the United States must take the action to do it by law.

I do not pose as an expert, as I said earlier, in weapons systems. I know we need modern technology. I know we need a modern, effective Army and Navy. I know we need a good Air Force, and I know we need missile protection. I believe in these things. But I also think that, like most things in our own private lives, you cannot have it all at once. Sometimes you have to stretch it out. Sometimes you have to take a look at

what is possible, not only at what is desirable.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

THE END OF BLACKOUT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, an article appeared on the front page of the Washington Star-News this afternoon with regard to the ban on the blackout that was voted by the Congress and signed by the President only last week.

The article says that there were more than 49,000 no-shows. It does observe that in the Robert F. Kennedy Stadium, there was a record turnout of 53,589 and 1,662 fans who bought tickets but failed to show up.

Mr. President, I do not question the figures stated in the article, but the one thing that I should like to discover, if we possibly can discover it at all, is the number of tickets in the hands of the scalpers. That would be a very interesting thing to know, when the proper time comes. As I understand it, there will be about 60,000 available seats at Kennedy Stadium, and there are about 53,000 now. The tickets are held by about 13,000 persons. I am wondering how many of those tickets get into the hands of scalpers. When the public finds out that there is a sellout—and there was one—then the scalpers would have bought their tickets at regular prices and—sometimes they sell such tickets for \$25, \$50, even \$100—when people learn that they might be sold out—and in fact they were—and the public cannot buy a ticket but the scalpers are selling tickets a question is raised. How come?

So I should like to know how the "no shows" occur. Is it that someone falls sick, or they just buy the ticket and then stay home and look at it on television rather than go to the game?

A survey was made a short time ago which indicated pretty much that those who buy their tickets want to go to the live game, they want to be there and catch all the excitement. That is generally true of professional football.

If any case can be made out of the "no shows" before we make up our minds that we might have made a mistake in Congress by passing the ban on the blackout, I want to see the roster of the people who buy the tickets and then hold them up for sale.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is so right that to try, for one game, one weekend, to make it look like it is the final evidence, is ridiculous. More importantly, the legislation which the Senator sponsored provides that a sellout must occur 72 hours before the game.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, but that is not the question. The question is this, that if

people have the idea the game will show up on television, even though they may have purchased a ticket and there is a sellout, for some reason they might prefer to remain at home—

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the team still gets the money—

Mr. PASTORE. I know, but then there is the question of the frankfurters and the parking, and so forth, but we are not interested in hot dogs. The people pay to see the game.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me add, having attended games at both stadiums—which I prefer—as well as at home, I get more liberty in being able to eat hot dogs, beer, pop, peanuts, popcorn at the game than I do at home. At home I have a lady who advises me about my diet. At the football game it is a great day. A man is free. So I doubt that it will hurt the hot dog business—

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator must remember that, first of all, he happens to be a non-Catholic. I am a Catholic. Up until a short while ago, even if we went to a game on Friday we would not eat a hotdog. So, the Senator is lucky.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Senator, we have had that all changed. Now there is equal opportunity for all. [Laughter.]

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that, on September 13, 1973, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1841) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with regard to the broadcasting of certain professional sports clubs' games.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. NUNN) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON ORDERLY LIQUIDATION OF STOCKS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES HELD BY THE COMMODITY CORPORATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, dated July 1973 (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the financial condition of that organization, as of December 31, 1972 (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. NUNN):

A resolution adopted by the Reformed Church in America, New York, N.Y., relating to the military-industrial complex. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BIBLE, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 988. A bill to designate certain lands in the Shenandoah National Park, Va., as wilderness (Rept. No. 93-393).

By Mr. TALMADGE (for Mr. Long), from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 4200. An act to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 93-394).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD (for Mr. SPARKMAN), from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Bradford Mills of New Jersey, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation; and

Allie C. Felder, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The above nominations were reported with the recommendation that the nominations be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. John V. Brennan, U.S. Marine Corps, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Marine Corps.

REFERRAL OF NOMINATION TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on September 7, 1973, the Senate received the nomination of William W. Blunt, Jr., to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Blunt is to be the Administrator of the Economic Development Administration, established under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended. His nomination was inadvertently referred to the Committee on Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of William W. Blunt, Jr., to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce be re-referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2418. A bill for the relief of Enrique Alfredo Ceballos. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. CURTIS):

S. 2419. A bill to correct typographical and clerical errors in Public Law 93-86. Considered and passed.

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. EAGLETON):

S. 2420. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to adjust ceiling prices applicable to certain petroleum products and to permit retailers of such products to pass through increased costs. Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2421. A bill to incorporate World War I Overseas Flyers, Inc. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 2422. A bill to establish a National Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape and provide financial assistance for a research and demonstration program into the causes, consequences, prevention, treatment, and control of rape. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2423. A bill for the relief of Angela Garza. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FANNIN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 2424. A bill to authorize the partition of the surface rights in the joint use area of the 1882 Executive Order Hopi Reservation and the surface and subsurface rights in the 1934 Navajo Reservation between the Hopi and Navajo Tribes, to provide for allotments to certain Palute Indians, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2425. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abelardo B. Agillar. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2426. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to limit the power of the Secretary of Transportation to delegate his authority to examine medical qualifications of airmen. Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution establishing an independent commission to conduct a study of the Executive Office of the President and to make recommendations for reforms to increase cooperation between that Office and the Congress, to restore a balance of power between the Executive and Legislative branches of the Government, and to increase the accountability of the Executive Office of the President to the Congress and the public. Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 154. A joint resolution to designate October 23, 1973, as "National Film Day." Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BAYH (for himself and Mr. EAGLETON):

S. 2420. A bill to amend the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 to adjust ceiling prices applicable to certain petroleum products and to permit retailers of such products to pass through increased costs. Referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and Senator EAGLETON legislation to amend the Economic Stabilization Act to correct gross inequities in the phase IV petroleum industry rules pro-

mulgated by the Cost of Living Council.

Under those rules gasoline retailers suffered the dual hardship of being forced to reduce prices and being denied the opportunity to regain added costs, even though all other sectors of the oil industry were permitted to raise prices. The effect of this injustice has been to force thousands of small businessmen into unprofitable positions and to raise the real spectre of large-scale bankruptcies among gasoline service station operators.

While I did note with some pleasure an announcement at the end of last week, following protests here in Washington by gasoline retailers from across the country, that the Cost of Living Council would revise its unfair regulations, I am not content to rely on the equity of that revision. Therefore, I am introducing this legislation which would do the following:

First, rescind a 1-cent per gallon wholesale gasoline price increase announced by a number of major oil companies in the past 10 days;

Second, require prenotification to the Cost of Living Council of any future wholesale price increase in oil products, in order to make certain such increases are tied to cost increases;

Third, permit retailers to return to the prices they were charging all summer while the price freeze was in effect; and

Fourth, allow retailers to charge consumers for any actual increase in the cost of their product, services or overhead.

This legislation is designed, Mr. President, to guarantee retailers fair treatment, and to keep the price of oil products to consumers as low as possible.

In the context of our fight against inflation, we cannot permit the major oil companies to take price increases except when costs rise. Certainly there otherwise would be significant upward price pressure stemming from fuel shortages. To allow these pressures to raise consumer prices exorbitantly would not only be inflationary, it would be tacit approval of exploitation of the fuel shortage.

I might say, Mr. President, that I remain puzzled and distressed as to why the Cost of Living Council promulgated regulations so clearly discriminatory toward gasoline and home heating oil retailers, and so considerate of major oil companies. During the first 6 months of 1973, the profits of major oil companies were up by an average of 39 percent, which would clearly indicate that their price increases have gone far beyond cost increases.

Rather than permitting the major oil companies to expand record profits, the Cost of Living Council would do better to protect a reasonable profit position for all sectors of the oil industry—including retailers—and, in the confines of such reasonable profits, keep prices to consumers as low as possible. Such a responsible course of action can be accomplished through the legislation I am introducing today, and I shall press for its passage if the revised regulations from the Cost of Living Council are not satisfactory.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record a copy of my bill and, in a directly re-

lated approach, a copy of a letter being sent to the Cost of Living Council today by a large number of Senators concerned with this problem.

There being no objection, the bill and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2420

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(k) (1) Not later than 30 days following the date of enactment of this subsection, the President or his delegate shall issue an order—

"(A) stabilizing the wholesale prices of petroleum fuels at the September 7, 1973, levels;

"(B) requiring wholesalers of such fuels to notify the President or his delegate of any increase in the wholesale price for any such fuel at least 15 days prior to the date on which increase is put into effect;

"(C) establishing base prices for retail sales of each such fuel at the freeze price levels; and

"(D) permitting a passthrough of any cost increase incurred by retailers of such fuels.

"(2) As used in paragraph (1)—

"(A) 'freeze price' means the highest lawful price charged by a retailer of a petroleum fuel for such fuel during the period June 1, 1973, to June 8, 1973, or in the case of a retailer who had no transactions during such period, during the nearest preceding 7-day period in which he had a transaction; and

"(B) 'petroleum fuel' means gasoline, diesel fuel grade number 2-D, and heating oil grade number 2."

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., September 17, 1973.

Dr. JOHN T. DUNLOP,
Director, Cost of Living Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. DUNLOP: We are persuaded that the Cost of Living Council's Phase Four regulations governing the oil industry have placed the nation's gasoline and home heating oil retailers in a totally unreasonable position. The combination of reduced mark-ups and curtailment in supplies will likely force many of these small businessmen out of business in a matter of weeks.

We did note that the Council has agreed to review these regulations. In this regard, we want to urge strongly that the Cost of Living Council immediately use its authority, granted by Congress in the Economic Stabilization Act, to revise those Phase Four regulations in a fashion that will ensure retailers of an adequate price mark-up. We recognize the desirability of holding down the price of fuel to consumers and will welcome anything that can be accomplished toward that goal within the framework of revised regulations protecting the legitimate interests of retailers.

Because of the urgency of this matter we request an immediate response.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2421. A bill to incorporate World War I Overseas Flyers, Inc. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am introducing for appropriate reference a bill to provide a Federal charter for World War I overseas flyers. I have introduced this legislation for this organization, of which our late colleague Spessard Holland was a member, in the past, and I am hopeful that the Senate will act favorably upon the measure this Congress. In order that my colleagues

can be provided with more extensive information about the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the remarks I made upon its introduction last Congress be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the bill and remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 2421

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Lawrence C. Ames of Oakland, California; Lucas V. Beau, of Washington District of Columbia; Lewis L. Carruthers of Memphis, Tennessee; John M. Davies of the Commonwealth of Virginia; Howard Eales of Washington, District of Columbia; Harold L. George of Los Angeles, California; Percival G. Hart, of Beverly Hills, California; Charles W. Kerwood of Washington, District of Columbia; Reed G. Landis of the State of Arkansas; John A. Logan of Washington, District of Columbia; John P. Morris of Washington, District of Columbia; Martin F. Scanlon of Washington, District of Columbia; Carl Spaatz of the State of Maryland; Leigh Wade of Washington, District of Columbia; and Ira Milton Jones of the State of Wisconsin and their successors are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of "World War I Overseas Flyers, Incorporated" (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "corporation") and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession. Such corporation shall have the powers and be subject to the limitations and restrictions contained in this Act.

COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. A majority of the persons named in the first section of this Act are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of bylaws, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary to complete the organization of the corporation.

OBJECTS AND PURPOSES OF CORPORATION

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

- (1) to promote peace and good will among the peoples of the United States and all the nations of the earth;
- (2) to preserve the memories and incidents of the air service of the Great War 1917-1918;
- (3) to cement the ties of love and comradeship born of service; and
- (4) to consecrate the efforts of its members to mutual helpfulness and service their country.

CORPORATE POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

- (1) to sue and be sued, complain, and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;
- (2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

- (3) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as its business may require and define their authority and duties;

- (4) to adopt and amend bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act or any other law of the United States or any State in which it is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

- (5) to make and carry out contracts;
- (6) to receive contributions or grants of money or property to be devoted to the carrying out of its purposes;

- (7) to acquire by purchase, lease, or otherwise, such real or personal property, or any interest therein, wherever situated, necessary or appropriate for carrying out its objects and purposes and subject to the provisions of law of the State in which such